UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/050,515	01/18/2002	Thomas Layne Bascom	12038	7770

27082	7590	11/05/2004

DORSEY & WHITNEY LLP
1001 PENNSYLVANIA AVENUE, N.W.
SUITE 400 SOUTH
WASHINGTON, DC 20004

EXAMINER
STEVENS, ROBERT

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2176	

DATE MAILED: 11/05/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)
Office Action Summary	10/050,515	BASCOM ET AL.
	Examiner	Art Unit
	Robert M Stevens	2176

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE _3_ MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.
- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on _18 January 2002_.

2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**.   2b) ☒ This action is non-final.

3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4) ☒ Claim(s) _1-57_ is/are pending in the application.

    4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6) ☒ Claim(s) _1-57_ is/are rejected.

7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9) ☒ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on _18 January 2002_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☒ objected to by the Examiner.

    Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

    Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

    a) ☐ All   b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:

      1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

      2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

      3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

    * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)

2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)

3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date _1/18/2002_.

4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ .

5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)

6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

1.   Claims 1-57 are pending in Application No. 10/050,515, entitled "System and

Method for Collecting, Storing, Managing and Providing Categorized Information

Related to a Document Object", filed 1/18/2002 by Bascom et al. Claims 1, 21 and 40

are independent.

2.   The Office acknowledges Information Disclosure Statement (IDS) filed on

1/18/2002. Note, however, that the Office has not considered the Goldfarb non-patent

literature because a copy of the referenced literature was not supplied with the IDS

submission.

Priority

3.   Applicant claims provisional priority, referencing provisional applications

60/273,520 (filed 3/7/2001) and 60/282,470 (filed 4/10/2001). The Office notes, though,

that the inventive entity of the instant non-provisional application (Bascom and Jones) is

not a subset of either of the provisional applications (Bascom).

Since any material contributed by Jones is new, the Office has conservatively **set**

the priority date of the instant non-provisional application to be its date of filing

(1/18/2002). Note that this may be overcome (wholly or partially) by: (1) adding the

name of an inventor in a provisional application, where the name was omitted without

deceptive intent, in accordance with 37 CFR 1.48(d); or (2) prosecuting only those

claims attributable to Jones in the instant application, and filing a CIP, claiming benefit

to the instant application.

Additionally, Applicant has not complied with one or more conditions for receiving

the benefit of an earlier filing date under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) as follows:

An application in which the benefits of an earlier application are desired must

contain a specific reference to the prior application(s) in the first sentence of the

specification or in an application data sheet (37 CFR 1.78(a)(2) and (a)(5)). The

specific reference to any prior nonprovisional application must include the relationship

(i.e., continuation, divisional, or continuation-in-part) between the applications except

when the reference is to a prior application of a CPA assigned the same application

number.

Drawings

4.   The drawings are objected to because several figures (esp. Fig. 1 [#41, 51], 2

[#42, 52, and others] and 3A) appear to contain links back to their invoking devices. Are

the arrows wanted on both ends of these "links"?

5.   The Fig. 7 "diamond" representation of #720 does not appear to be correct.

These entities usually indicate a Yes/No type decision.

6.   Fig. 9 contains a misspelling (which should be "Dessert"). Please correct all spelling/grammatical/etc. errors throughout the specification, including the claims and drawings.

7.   The drawings are objected to as failing to comply with 37 CFR 1.84(p)(5) because they do not include the following reference sign(s) mentioned in the description: 100.

8.   Corrected drawing sheets are required in reply to the Office action to avoid abandonment of the application. Any amended replacement drawing sheet should include all of the figures appearing on the immediate prior version of the sheet, even if only one figure is being amended. The figure or figure number of an amended drawing should not be labeled as "amended." If a drawing figure is to be canceled, the appropriate figure must be removed from the replacement sheet, and where necessary, the remaining figures must be renumbered and appropriate changes made to the brief description of the several views of the drawings for consistency. Additional replacement sheets may be necessary to show the renumbering of the remaining figures. The replacement sheet(s) should be labeled "Replacement Sheet" in the page header (as per 37 CFR 1.84(c) and 1.121(d)) so as not to obstruct any portion of the drawing figures. If the changes are not accepted by the examiner, the applicant will be notified and informed of any required corrective action in the next Office action. The objection to the drawings will not be held in abeyance.

Specification

9.   The disclosure is objected to because of the following informalities:

A. The paragraph starting at line 29 of page 21 addresses the steps of

Fig. 7 out of order.

B. There are several references to system 100 throughout the

specification (e.g., p. 5 line 4), but this element does not appear in the drawings.

See the comments in the Drawing section above.

Please make the necessary corrections.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

10.   The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

> The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly
> claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

11.   **Claims 1-20, 25-28, 34 and 40-57 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second.**

paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the

subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

In regards to independent claims 1 and 40, these claims use the language (in lines 8-9 or 9-10, as appropriate) "<u>based upon</u> the document object currently accessed by the user". First of all, the language "based upon" renders the claim vague and indefinite. Additionally, the entire phrase makes the claim difficult to understand.

Claims 2 – 20 and 41-57 are dependent upon claims 1 and 40, as appropriate, and therefore likewise rejected.

Also in regards to claim 2, this claim (allowing only authorized users) negates a limitation of claim 1 (which allows all users). As such, claim 2 is an improper dependent claim and its scope is indeterminable. Dependent claims can only add limitations, not remove or overwrite limitations. A simple test is "Would a prior art passage reading on the dependent claim in question, also read on the corresponding parent claim?". Regarding claim 2 of the instant application, the answer is no.

Claims 14 and 41 are substantially similar to claim 2 and therefore likewise rejected.

Also in regards to claim 5, this claim (to automatic operation) negates the limitations of claims 1 and 4 (directed toward manual operation). Refer to the claim 2 comments above.

Claims 25 and 26 each contain references to the trademark/trade name Linkspace. (TESS search result included in Notice of References Cited.) Where a trademark or trade name is used in a claim as a limitation to identify or describe a particular material or product, the claim does not comply with the requirements of 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph. See *Ex parte Simpson*, 218 USPQ 1020 (Bd. App. 1982). The claim scope is uncertain since the trademark or trade name cannot be used properly to identify any particular material or product. A trademark or trade name is used to identify a source of goods, and not the goods themselves. Thus, a trademark or trade name does not identify or describe the goods associated with the trademark or trade name. In the present case, the trademark/trade name is used to identify/describe account records and a graphical user interface, respectively, and, accordingly, the identification/description is indefinite.

Claims 27 and 28 are dependent upon claim 26 and therefore likewise rejected.

Claim 34 does not appear to add anything to claim 33, making the scope of claim 34 vague and indefinite. Note that the limitation contained in claim 34 already exists in claim 33 by virtue of its parent, claim 31.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

12.   The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

13.   **Claims 1, 4, 6-13, 15-23, 26-27, 37-40, 43, 45-51 and 53-57 are rejected under**

35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Goerz, Jr. et al. (US Patent Application

Publication No. US 2002/0065671, filed Jan. 30, 2001 and claiming benefit of CIP filing

date of Sep. 12, 2000, hereafter referred to as "Goerz") in view of Sandra E. Eddy et al.

(Teach Yourself XML, IDG Books Worldwide, Inc., Foster City, CA, (c) 1999, hereafter

referred to as "Eddy").

Regarding independent claim 1, Goerz discloses:

A method for enabling users of a network to create, store, and provide access to relationships among document objects stored on the network, the method comprising the steps of:

storing the link relationship in one or more link directories; ([0071] re: supercategories and subcategories) *and*
providing all users of the network access to the link relationships stored in the one or more link directories based upon the document object currently accessed by the user ([0007] re: no discrimination among users of prior art browsers).

However, Goerz does not explicitly disclose:

allowing a user of the network to create a link relationship between a first document object and a second document object;

Eddy, though, discloses:

allowing a user of the network to create a link relationship between a first document object and a second document object; (p. 311, code listing 21-10, especially ' href="/regions/nyc.xml" ')

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to apply the teachings of Eddy for the benefit of Goerz, because to do so would enable a user to use a link to choose from several locations as taught by Eddy in the first paragraph of p. 303. These references were all applicable to the same field of endeavor, i.e., the linking of Internet documents.

Regarding claim 4, which is dependent upon claim 1, the limitations of claim 1 have been previously addressed.

However, Goerz does not explicitly disclose:

> *wherein the allowing step comprises:*
> *a first user locating a first document object;*
> *the first user locating a second document object related to the first document object in some manner determined by the first user; and*
> *the first user creating a link relationship between the first document object and the second document object.*

Eddy, though, discloses:

> *wherein the allowing step comprises:*
> *a first user locating a first document object;* (p. 311 listing 21-10, re: the current document)
> *the first user locating a second document object related to the first document object in some manner determined by the first user;* (p. 311 listing 21-10, re: selection of the link [i.e., document] "nyc.xml") and
> *the first user creating a link relationship between the first document object and the second document object.* (p. 311 listing 21-10, re: ' href="regions/nyc.xml" ')

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the

invention to apply the teachings of Eddy for the benefit of Goerz, because to do so

would enable a user to use a link to choose from several locations as taught by Eddy in

the first paragraph of p. 303. These references were all applicable to the same field of

endeavor, i.e., the linking of Internet documents.

Regarding claim 6, which is dependent upon claim 1, the limitations of claim 1

have been previously addressed.

However, Goerz does not explicitly disclose:

> *wherein the storing step comprises:*
> *storing a link relationship entry in a link relationship table, wherein*
> *the link relationship entry comprises fields including a first link reference to*
> *the first document object and a second link reference to the second*
> *document object;*
> *assigning link relationship attributes to the link relationship entry;*
> *and*
> *setting a directional indicator for the link relationship entry.*

Eddy, though, discloses:

> *wherein the storing step comprises:*
> *storing a link relationship entry in a link relationship table, wherein*
> *the link relationship entry comprises fields including a first link reference to*
> *the first document object* (p. 311 listing 21-10, re: the link to "nyc.xml"*) and*
> *a second link reference to the second document object;* (p. 311 listing 21-
> 10, re: the current document)
> - assigning link relationship attributes to the link relationship entry; *(p.*
> *311 listing 21-10, re: the link to "nyc.xml")* and
> *setting a directional indicator for the link relationship entry.* (p. 311
> listing 21-10, re: "regions" link relationship entity of 1st line and href code
> assigning link references)

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the

invention to apply the teachings of Eddy for the benefit of Goerz, because to do so

would enable a user to use a link to choose from several locations as taught by Eddy in

the first paragraph of p. 303. These references were all applicable to the same field of

endeavor, i.e., the linking of Internet documents.

Regarding claim 7, which is dependent upon claim 6, the limitations of claim 6

have been previously addressed.

Goerz also discloses:

> *wherein the step of storing the link relationship in one or more link directories further comprises:*
> > *storing the first link reference to the first document object in a document object table;* ([0041], re: indexed knowledge base 38 and supercategories)
> > *storing the second link reference to the second document object in a document object table;* ([0041], re: indexed knowledge base 38 and supercategories) *and*

However, Goerz does not explicitly disclose:

> > *assigning document object attributes to the first link reference associated with the first document object;*
> > *assigning document object attributes to the second link reference associated with the second document object.*

Eddy, though, discloses:

> > *assigning document object attributes to the first link reference associated with the first document object;* (p. 311, listing 21-10 first title attribute set to "New York City")
> > *assigning document object attributes to the second link reference associated with the second document object.* (p. 311, listing 21-10 second title attribute set to "Long Island")

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the

invention to apply the teachings of Eddy for the benefit of Goerz, because to do so

would enable a user to use a link to choose from several locations as taught by Eddy in

the first paragraph of p. 303. These references were all applicable to the same field of

endeavor, i.e., the linking of Internet documents.

Regarding claim 8, which is dependent upon claim 7, the limitations of claim 7

have been previously addressed.

However, Goerz does not explicitly disclose:

> *wherein one or more of the link relationship attributes are set; and*
> *a directional indicator for the link relationship attribute is set by*
> *associating one document object attribute for the first link reference with*
> *one document object attribute for the second link reference.*

Eddy, though, discloses:

> *wherein one or more of the link relationship attributes are set;* (p.
> 311 listing 21-10, re: set of href assignment statements) *and*
> *a directional indicator for the link relationship attribute is set by*
> *associating one document object attribute for the first link reference with*
> *one document object attribute for the second link reference.* (p. 311 listing
> 21-10, link direction set via href statements)

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the

invention to apply the teachings of Eddy for the benefit of Goerz, because to do so

would enable a user to use a link to choose from several locations as taught by Eddy in

the first paragraph of p. 303. These references were all applicable to the same field of

endeavor, i.e., the linking of Internet documents.

Regarding claim 9, which is dependent upon claim 4, the limitations of claim 4

have been previously addressed.

Goerz further discloses:

> *further comprising displaying to a second user a link reference to a*
> *document object related to a document object the second user is currently*
> *accessing, wherein the link reference displayed to the second user is*
> *determined by identifying those link relationships stored in the one or more*
> *link directories that include a link reference to a network address of the*
> *currently accessed document object.* (Fig. 19I and [0095] discussing
> collaboration)

Regarding claim 10, which is dependent upon claim 9, the limitations of claim 9

have been previously addressed.

Goerz further discloses:

> *wherein the displaying step comprises displaying more than one*
> *link reference from one or more link directories.* (Fig. 19I, the display of
> more than one company reference)

Regarding claim 11, which is dependent upon claim 9, the limitations of claim 9

have been previously addressed.

Goerz further discloses:

> wherein the displaying step comprises sorting and presenting one
> or more link references by the one or more link directories storing the link
> references. (Fig. 19 E, search results numbered 1-6 are sorted
> alphabetically and displayed)

Regarding claim 12, which is dependent upon claim 11, the limitations of claim

11 have been previously addressed.

Goerz further discloses:

> wherein the displaying step comprises sorting and presenting the
> one or more link references by attributes of the link relationships and link
> references. (Fig. 19 I, companies are sorted by type)

Regarding claim 13, which is dependent upon claim 1, the limitations of claim 1

have been previously addressed.

Goerz further discloses:

> wherein the method is used on one or more of: a private network, a
> closed network, a public network, and a private network that is connected
> to a public network. (Fig. 1 #10, the Internet [a public network])

Regarding claim 15, which is dependent upon claim 1, the limitations of claim 1

have been previously addressed.

Goerz further discloses:

> wherein the one or more link directories may be stored on a server
> connected to the network by means of a secure connection. (Fig. 1 #2,
> and security discussions in [0037], [0013] and [0095])

Regarding claim 16, which is dependent upon claim 1, the limitations of claim 1

have been previously addressed.

However, Goerz does not explicitly disclose:

> further comprising assigning attributes to the link relationship
> established between the first document object and the second document
> object.

Eddy, though, discloses:

> *further comprising assigning attributes to the link relationship*
> *established between the first document object and the second document*
> *object.* (p. 311 listing 21-10, second code line re: New York Regions title
> attribute assigned to regions extended link [i.e., link relationship])

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the

invention to apply the teachings of Eddy for the benefit of Goerz, because to do so

would enable a user to use a link to choose from several locations as taught by Eddy in

the first paragraph of p. 303. These references were all applicable to the same field of

endeavor, i.e., the linking of Internet documents.

Regarding claim 17, which is dependent upon claim 16, the limitations of claim

16 have been previously addressed.

However, Goerz does not explicitly disclose:

> *further comprising assigning attributes to a first link reference to the*
> *first document object and a second link reference to the second document*
> *object.*

Eddy, though, discloses:

> further comprising assigning attributes to a first link reference to the
> first document object and a second link reference to the second document
> object. (p. 311 listing 21-10, re: title=New York City, and
> href=/regions/li.xml)

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the

invention to apply the teachings of Eddy for the benefit of Goerz, because to do so

would enable a user to use a link to choose from several locations as taught by Eddy in

the first paragraph of p. 303. These references were all applicable to the same field of

endeavor, i.e., the linking of Internet documents.

Regarding claim 18, which is dependent upon claim 16, the limitations of claim

16 have been previously addressed.

Goerz further discloses:

> wherein the link relationship stored in the one or more link
> directories may be organized, sorted, searched and filtered by one or
> more attributes assigned to the link relationships. (Fig. 19 I, organize, sort,
> search and filter by company type)

Regarding claim 19, which is dependent upon claim 17, the limitations of claim

17 have been previously addressed.

Goerz further discloses:

> wherein the link references stored in the one or more link
> directories may be organized, sorted, searched and filtered by one or
> more attributes assigned to the link references. (Fig. 19 I, organize, sort,
> search and filter by company type)

Regarding claim 20, which is dependent upon claim 1, the limitations of claim 1

have been previously addressed.

However, Goerz does not explicitly disclose:

> *wherein the step of providing one or more link references to document*
> *objects on the network comprises:*
> > *selecting the displayed link references for display based on a link*
> *relationship to the currently displayed document object; and*
> > *filtering the displayed link references by attributes.*

Eddy, though, discloses:

> *wherein the step of providing one or more link references to document objects on the network comprises:*
>> *selecting the displayed link references for display based on a link relationship to the currently displayed document object;* (p. 309 listing 21-8, link relationship set using href) *and*
>> *filtering the displayed link references by attributes.* (p. 309 listing 21-8, upon link traversal play sound according to the assigned attribute)

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to apply the teachings of Eddy for the benefit of Goerz, because to do so would enable a user to use a link to choose from several locations as taught by Eddy in the first paragraph of p. 303. These references were all applicable to the same field of endeavor, i.e., the linking of Internet documents.

Regarding independent claim 21, Goerz discloses:

> A system for establishing and providing access to relationships between document projects stored on a network wherein the relationship between a first document object and a second document object may be created by an individual user of the network and provided to other users of the network, the system comprising:

>> *one or more client devices* (Fig. 1 # 16A) *that access document objects stored on the network* (Fig. 1 # 10) *... ; and*
>> *one or more servers* (Fig. 1 #2) *that store ... created by the client devices* (Fig. 1 # 16A) *and transmit* (Fig. 1 path from #10 to #16A) *... to the client devices.* (Fig. 1 # 16A).

However, Goerz does not explicitly disclose:

> *and allow creation of link relationships between a first document object and a second document object*
>> *the link relationships*

> *one or more link relationships and link references*

Eddy, though, discloses:

> *and allow creation of link relationships between a first document object and a second document object* (p. 311 listing 21-10, re: href assignments)
> *the link relationships* (p. 311 listing 21-10, re: href assignments)
> *one or more link relationships and link references* (p. 311 listing 21-10, re: href assignments and creation of extended link)

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to apply the teachings of Eddy for the benefit of Goerz, because to do so would enable a user to use a link to choose from several locations as taught by Eddy in the first paragraph of p. 303. These references were all applicable to the same field of endeavor, i.e., the linking of Internet documents.

Regarding claim 22, which is dependent upon claim 21, the limitations of claim 21 have been previously addressed.

Goerz further discloses:

> wherein the one or more servers filter and sort the link relationships and link references before transmitting the link relationships and link references to the client devices. (Fig. 19E, search results numbered 1-6 are filtered/sorted alphabetically and displayed. When/where sorting - a topic in every computer science data structure class - takes place is irrelevant from a patentability standpoint.)

Regarding claim 23, which is dependent upon claim 21, the limitations of claim 21 have been previously addressed.

Goerz further discloses:

> wherein the client devices filter and sort the link relationships and link references after the link relationships and link references are transmitted to the client devices from the one or more servers. (Fig. 19 E, search results numbered 1-6 are sorted alphabetically and displayed. When/where sorting - a topic in every computer science data structure class - takes place is irrelevant from a patentability standpoint.)

Regarding claim 26, which is dependent upon claim 21, the limitations of claim

21 have been previously addressed.

Goerz further discloses:

> *wherein the one or more client devices comprise:*
> *a client tool, wherein the client tool comprises a Linkspace graphic user interface display;* ([0093])
> *a rendering tool that renders and displays document objects* (Fig. 16·C), *the rendering tool comprising:*
> *a graphic user interface display* ([0100], re: screen shots); *and*
> *a document object network address* ([0095], re: group collaborations and access to Internet resources); *and*
> *a network access tool that connects the rendering tool and the client tool to the network.* ([0094], re: online activities)

Regarding claim 27, which is dependent upon claim 26, the limitations of claim

26 have been previously addressed.

Goerz further discloses:

> *wherein the document object network address comprises a Uniform Resource Locator.* ([0095], re: URL)

Claim 37 is substantially similar to claim 13, and therefore likewise rejected.

Claim 38 is substantially similar to claim 14, and therefore likewise rejected.

Claim 39 is substantially similar to claim 15, and therefore likewise rejected.

Regarding independent claim 40, Goerz discloses:

A computer readable medium upon which is embedded instructions for carrying out a method for enabling users of a network to create, store, and provide access to relationships among document objects stored on the network, the method comprising the steps of:

storing the link relationship in one or more link directories; ([0071] re: supercategories and subcategories) *and*
providing all users of the network access to the link relationships stored in the one or more link directories based upon the document object currently accessed by the user ([0007] re: no discrimination among users of prior art browsers).

However, Goerz does not explicitly disclose:

allowing a user of the network to create a link relationship between a first document object and a second document object;

Eddy, though, discloses:

allowing a user of the network to create a link relationship between a first document object and a second document object; (p. 311, code listing 21-10, especially ' href="/regions/nyc.xml" ')

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to apply the teachings of Eddy for the benefit of Goerz, because to do so would enable a user to use a link to choose from several locations as taught by Eddy in the first paragraph of p. 303. These references were all applicable to the same field of endeavor, i.e., the linking of Internet documents.

Claim 43 is substantially similar to claims 4, and therefore likewise rejected.

Claims 45-51 are substantially similar to claims 6-12, respectively, and therefore likewise rejected.

Claims 53-57 are substantially similar to claims 15-19, respectively, and therefore likewise rejected.

14.   **Claims 2-3, 14, 41-42 and 52 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a)** as being unpatentable over Goerz, Jr. et al. (US Patent Application Publication No. US 2002/0065671, filed Jan. 30, 2001 and claiming benefit of CIP filing date of Sep. 12, 2000, hereafter referred to as "Goerz") in view of Sandra E. Eddy et al. (Teach Yourself XML, IDG Books Worldwide, Inc., Foster City, CA, (c) 1999, hereafter referred to as "Eddy") and further in view of Li (US No. 6,725,227, provisionally filed Oct. 2, 1998, hereafter referred to as "Li").

Regarding claim 2, which is dependent upon claim 1, the limitations of claim 1 have been previously addressed.

However, Goerz does not explicitly disclose:

> *wherein the providing step comprises providing access only to authorized users.*

Li, though, discloses:

> *wherein the providing step comprises providing access only to
> authorized users.* (col. 1 lines 53-56, re: access control)

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the

invention to apply the teachings of Li for the benefit of Goerz in view of Eddy, because

to do so would allow users in a business environment to control access to information

by individuals, projects and departments, as taught by Li in col. 1 lines 53-56. These

references were all applicable to the same field of endeavor, i.e., the linking of Internet

documents.

Regarding claim 3, which is dependent upon claim 1, the limitations of claim 1

have been previously addressed.

However, Goerz does not explicitly disclose:

> *further comprising authorizing users of the network to perform the
> allowing, storing and providing steps.*

Li, though, discloses:

> *further comprising authorizing users of the network to perform the
> allowing, storing and providing steps.* (col. 1 lines 53-56, re: access
> control)

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the

invention to apply the teachings of Li for the benefit of Goerz in view of Eddy, because

to do so would allow users in a business environment to control access to information

by individuals, projects and departments, as taught by Li in col. 1 lines 53-56. These

references were all applicable to the same field of endeavor, i.e., the linking of Internet

documents.

Regarding claim 14, which is dependent upon claim 1, the limitations of claim 1

have been previously addressed.

However, Goerz does not explicitly disclose:

> *wherein the one or more link directories are accessible only by a specific individual user of a client device.*

Li, though, discloses:

> wherein the one or more link directories are accessible only by a specific individual user of a client device. (col. 1 lines 53-56, re: access control)

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the

invention to apply the teachings of Li for the benefit of Goerz in view of Eddy, because

to do so would allow users in a business environment to control access to information

by individuals, projects and departments, as taught by Li in col. 1 lines 53-56. These

references were all applicable to the same field of endeavor, i.e., the linking of Internet

documents.

Claim 41 is substantially similar to claim 2, and therefore likewise rejected.

Claim 42 is substantially similar to claim 3, and therefore likewise rejected.

Claim 52 is substantially similar to claim 14, and therefore likewise rejected.

15.   **Claims 5, 24-25, 28-36 and 44 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a)** as being

unpatentable over Goerz, Jr. et al. (US Patent Application Publication No. US

2002/0065671, filed Jan. 30, 2001 and claiming benefit of CIP filing date of Sep. 12,

2000, hereafter referred to as "Goerz") in view of Sandra E. Eddy et al. (Teach Yourself

XML, IDG Books Worldwide, Inc., Foster City, CA, (c) 1999, hereafter referred to as

"Eddy") and further in view of Chang (US No. 5,694,594, issued Dec. 2, 1997, hereafter

referred to as "Chang").

Regarding claim 5, which is dependent upon claim 4, the limitations of claim 4

have been previously addressed.

However, Goerz does not explicitly disclose:

> *wherein one or more of the steps of the method are accomplished*
> *by automated procedures not requiring interaction with the user.*

Chang, though, discloses:

> *wherein one or more of the steps of the method are accomplished*
> *by automated procedures not requiring interaction with the user.* (Abstract
> discloses the automatic generation of links)

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the

invention to apply the teachings of Chang for the benefit of Goerz in view of Eddy,

because to do so would allow a user to control the generation of links as taught by

Chang in col. 8 lines 61-63. These references were all applicable to the same field of

endeavor, i.e., the linking of Internet documents.

Regarding claim 24, which is dependent upon claim 21, the limitations of claim

21 have been previously addressed.

Georz further discloses:

> *wherein the one or more servers comprise:*
> *one or more link directories that store the link relationships created*
> *on the one or more client devices;* ([0071], re: supercategories and
> subcategories)
> *a server manager module that coordinates communication* ([0069],
> re: content management tool) *between the one or more link directories*
> ([0069], re: indexed knowledge base 38, which is used in conjunction with
> the content management tool), *a user directory* ([0057], re: user account
> on Website), *... , and the one or more client devices* (Fig. 1 # 16A) *if those*
> *client devices are requesting services from the server* (Fig. 1 # 2); *and*
> *a user data store that stores information regarding authorized users*
> *of the servers and link directories* ([0041], re: indexed knowledge base 38
> and supercategories) *and*

However, Goerz does not explicitly disclose:

> a database of user profile data

Chang, though, discloses:

> *a database of user profile data* (Abstract discloses the use of a
> user profile)

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the

invention to apply the teachings of Chang for the benefit of Goerz in view of Eddy,

because to do so would allow a user to control the generation of links as taught by

Chang in col. 8 lines 61-63. These references were all applicable to the same field of

endeavor, i.e., the linking of Internet documents.

Regarding claim 25, which is dependent upon claim 24, the limitations of claim

24 have been previously addressed.

Georz further discloses:

> *wherein the user data store comprises:*
> *a user directory, the user directory comprising one or more user data records containing personal identifying information and information regarding which of the one or more link directories and the one or more servers a user may be authorized to access;* ([0057], especially re: user account)
> *a user account store, the user account store comprising one or more user account records each containing Linkspace system usage data for each authorized user of the servers and link directories* ([0057], especially re: user account) *and*

However, Goerz does not explicitly disclose:

> a user profile store, the user profile store comprising one or more user profile records each containing one or more user profiles for each authorized user of the servers and link directories;

Chang, though, discloses:

> *a user profile store, the user profile store comprising one or more user profile records each containing one or more user profiles for each authorized user of the servers and link directories;* (Abstract discloses the use of a user profile)

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the

invention to apply the teachings of Chang for the benefit of Goerz in view of Eddy,

because to do so would allow a user to control the generation of links as taught by

Chang in col. 8 lines 61-63. These references were all applicable to the same field of

endeavor, i.e., the linking of Internet documents.

Regarding claim 28, which is dependent upon claim 26, the limitations of claim

26 have been previously addressed.

Georz further discloses:

> *wherein the one or more servers comprise:*
> *one or more link directories that store the link relationships;* ([0071],
> re: supercategories and subcategories)
> *a communications module that coordinates communication* ([0069],
> re: content management tool) *between the one or more link directories*
> ([0069], re: indexed knowledge base 38, which is used in conjunction with
> the content management tool)*, a user directory* ([0057], re: user account
> on Website), ... , *and the one or more client devices;* (Fig. 1 # 16A) *and*
> *a user data store that stores information regarding authorized users*
> *of the client tool* ([0041], re: indexed knowledge base 38 and
> supercategories) *and*

However, Goerz does not explicitly disclose:

> a database of user profile data

Chang, though, discloses:

> *a database of user profile data* (Abstract discloses the use of a
> user profile)

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the

invention to apply the teachings of Chang for the benefit of Goerz in view of Eddy,

because to do so would allow a user to control the generation of links as taught by

Chang in col. 8 lines 61-63. These references were all applicable to the same field of

endeavor, i.e., the linking of Internet documents.

Regarding claim 29, which is dependent upon claim 24, the limitations of claim

24 have been previously addressed.

However, Goerz does not explicitly disclose:

> wherein the one or more link directories comprise:
> *a link relationship table comprising a plurality of link relationship
> entries, the link relationship entries comprising:*
> *a first field comprising a first link reference to the first document
> object of the link relationship;*
> *a second field comprising a second link reference to the second
> document object of the link relationship;*
> *one or more link relationship attributes providing information that
> places the link relationship in a context useful to the user; and*
> *a directional indicator that indicates whether the link relationship
> between the first link reference to the first document object and the
> second link reference to the second document object applies in either
> direction or in both directions.*

Eddy, though, discloses:

> wherein the one or more link directories comprise:

> *a link relationship table comprising a plurality of link relationship
> entries, the link relationship entries comprising* (p. 311, code listing 21-10):
> *a first field comprising a first link reference to the first document
> object of the link relationship;* (p. 311, code listing 21-10 re:
> href="/regions/nyc.xml")
> *a second field comprising a second link reference to the second
> document object of the link relationship;* (p. 311, code listing 21-10 re:
> href="/regions/li.xml")
> *one or more link relationship attributes providing information that
> places the link relationship in a context useful to the user;* (p. 311, code
> listing 21-10 re: title="New York City") *and*
> *a directional indicator that indicates whether the link relationship
> between the first link reference to the first document object and the*

second link reference to the second document object applies in either direction or in both directions. (p. 311, listing 21-10 uses href to indicate link direction)

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to apply the teachings of Eddy for the benefit of Goerz and Chang, because to do so would enable a user to use a link to choose from several locations as taught by Eddy in the first paragraph of p. 303. These references were all applicable to the same field of endeavor, i.e., the linking of Internet documents.

Regarding claim 30, which is dependent upon claim 29, the limitations of claim 29 have been previously addressed.

However, Goerz does not explicitly disclose:

> wherein the directional indicator comprises a plurality of directional indicator fields, each directional indicator field corresponding to one of the one or more link relationship attributes and indicating whether the corresponding link relationship attribute applies in one direction or in both directions between the first link reference to the first document object and the second link reference to the second document object.

Eddy, though, discloses:

> *wherein the directional indicator comprises a plurality of directional indicator fields, each directional indicator field corresponding to one of the one or more link relationship attributes and indicating whether the corresponding link relationship attribute applies in one direction or in both directions between the first link reference to the first document object and the second link reference to the second document object.* (p. 311, listing 21-10 uses a series of href assignments to indicate link direction)

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the

invention to apply the teachings of Eddy for the benefit of Goerz and Chang, because to

do so would enable a user to use a link to choose from several locations as taught by

Eddy in the first paragraph of p. 303. These references were all applicable to the same

field of endeavor, i.e., the linking of Internet documents.

Regarding claim 31, which is dependent upon claim 29, the limitations of claim

29 have been previously addressed.

However, Goerz does not explicitly disclose:

> *wherein the one or more link directories comprise:*
> *a document object table comprising a plurality of link reference*
> *entries, the link reference entries comprising:*
> *a network address of the document object on the network indicated*
> *by the link reference entry; and*
> one or more document object attributes providing information that
> places the document object indicated by the link reference entry in a
> context that is useful to the user.

Eddy, though, discloses:

> wherein the one or more link directories further comprise:
> *a document object table comprising a plurality of link reference*
> *entries* (p. 311 listing 21-10)*, the link reference entries comprising:*
> *a network address of the document object on the network indicated*
> *by the link reference entry;* (p. 310, code near bottom of left column '
> href="http://www.eddygrp.com/bug.doc" ') *and*
> *one or more document object attributes providing information that*
> *places the document object indicated by the link reference entry in a*
> *context that is useful to the user.* (p. 310, code near bottom of left column
> ' title="Bug Report 12/3/99" ')

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the

invention to apply the teachings of Eddy for the benefit of Goerz and Chang, because to

do so would enable a user to use a link to choose from several locations as taught by

Eddy in the first paragraph of p. 303. These references were all applicable to the same

field of endeavor, i.e., the linking of Internet documents.

Regarding claim 32, which is dependent upon claim 31, the limitations of claim

31 have been previously addressed.

Goerz further discloses:

> *wherein the network address comprises a Uniform Resource*
> *Locator.* ([0095], re: URL)

Regarding claim 33, which is dependent upon claim 32, the limitations of claim

32 have been previously addressed.

However, Goerz does not explicitly disclose:

> wherein the link reference entries further comprise a listing of all
> link relationship entries in which the network address of the document
> object indicated by the link reference entry is present in the first field or the
> second field of the link relationship entries.

Eddy, though, discloses:

> *wherein the link reference entries further comprise a listing of all*
> *link relationship entries in which the network address of the document*
> *object indicated by the link reference entry is present in the first field or the*
> *second field of the link relationship entries.* (p. 310 second code fragment

in left-most column discloses a network address [www.eddygrp.com/bug.doc] of a document object. Where the address is stored in a record or data structure is irrelevant as far as patentability is concerned.)

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to apply the teachings of Eddy for the benefit of Goerz and Chang, because to do so would enable a user to use a link to choose from several locations as taught by Eddy in the first paragraph of p. 303. These references were all applicable to the same field of endeavor, i.e., the linking of Internet documents.

Claim 34 is substantially similar to claim 32, and therefore likewise rejected.

Claim 35 is substantially similar to claim 32, and therefore likewise rejected.

Claim 36 is substantially similar to claim 32, and therefore likewise rejected.

Claim 44 is substantially similar to claim 5, and therefore likewise rejected.

Conclusion

16.   The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

Non-patent Literature
Harold, Elliotte Rusty, XML: Extensible Markup Language, IDG Books Worldwide, Foster City, CA, © 1998, pp. 245-258.
        "XML Linking Language (Xlink) Version 1.0 – W3C Candidate Recommendation 3 July 2000", downloaded from: http://web.archive.org/web/2000081507480/http://www.w3.org/TR/xlink/, pp. 1-45 (plus date page from WayBack Machine).
        Cattaneo, Fabiano, et al., "Managing Software Artifacts on the Web with Labyrinth", ICSE 2000, Limerick, Ireland, ACM 23000 1-58113-206-9/00/06, June 2000, pp. 746-749 (plus citation page).

Jelliffe, Rick, "Extended Linking Comes to the WWW: XLinks", Academia Sinica Computing Centre, Aug. 2, 1999, downloaded from: http://xml.ascc.net/en/utf-8/xll.html, pp. 1-5.

Ferraiolo, David F., et al., "A Role-Based Access Control Model and Reference Implementation Within a Corporate Intranet", ACM Transactions on Information and System Security, vol. 2, no. 1, Feb. 1999, pp. 34-64.

Whitehead, Jr., E. James, "WebDAV", Univ. of CA at Irvine, (under DARPA contract no. F30602-97-2-0021), Feb. 1998, pp. 1-2.

"Trademark Electronic Search System (TESS) search results page for LINKSPACE", downloaded from: http://tess2.uspto.gov/bin/showfield?f=doc&state=k6127i2.1, pp. 1-2.

US Patent Application Publications

Hsu et al	US2001/0049698
Dutta et al	US2002/0120646
Roberts et al	US2002/0120644
Dubey et al	US2003/0115546

US Patents

Lisle et al	6,069,630
Balabine et al	6,442,548
Inoue et al	6,336,123
Mital et al	6,189,012
Nielsen et al	6,055,542
Snow et al	6,055,540
Bakke et al	6,016,498
Nehab et al	6,029,182
Hennings et al	6,763,496
Bates et al	6,751,777
Law et al	6,754,873
Schillit et al	6,658,623
Serbinis et al	6,684,466
Tabuchi	6,212,533
Graham	6,647,534
Furusawa	5,884,079
Hoshino	5,983,241
Messerly	5,941,944
Schmonsees	5,842,221
Skarbo et al	6,725,227
Jordan	4,982,344

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Robert M Stevens whose telephone number is (571) 272-4102. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 6:30 - 3:00.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Joseph Feild can currently be reached on (571) 272-4090. The current fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306. However, note that the main number for Technology Center 2100 will be (571) 272-2100, as of mid-October 2004.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Robert M. Stevens
Art Unit 2176
Date: October 22, 2004

JOSEPH FEILD
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER

rms